The Classical Review

http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR

Celsus de Medicina *Aulus Cornelius Celsus: Ueber die Artzneiwissenschaft*; übersetzt und erklärt von Eduard Scheller: zweite Auflage von Walther Frieboes. Braunschweig: Vieweg und Sohn, 1906. 8vo. Pp. xlii + 862. Tafeln iv. M. 18.

Clifford Allbutt

The Classical Review / Volume 22 / Issue 05 / August 1908, pp 151 - 154
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00001712, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00001712

How to cite this article:
Clifford Allbutt (1908). The Classical Review, 22, pp 151-154 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00001712

any sympathy, will perhaps look kindly on the suggestion that these obscurities and inconsequences are most easily explained by supposing that, as *e.g.* in Ecl. x., so here Virgil is alluding to or half-quoting poems familiar to his readers. And whose poems could these be here (in Ecl. iii.) save Pollio's? 'Pollio et ipse facit noua carmina.' Let us assume for a moment that this is so. Then compare iii. 89, 'mella fluant illi, ferat et rubus asper amomum' with 4. 30, 'sudabunt roscida mella,' and 4. 25 'uulgo nascetur amomum.' Compare again 3. 92 'qui legitis flores et humi nescentia fraga,' with 4. 18-20: compare 3. 95 'latet anguis in herba' with 4. 24 occidet et serpens': and once more, 3. 93, 'ipse aries etiam nunc uellera siccat' with 4. 43-44, 'ipse sed in pratis aries . . . mutabit uellera luto.' (Add 3. 101, 4. 10.) These coincidences may be *mere* coincidences. But they are, I fancy, striking, and lend support to the view that Virgil owes something in the fourth Eclogue to Pollio.

I trust that these rather haphazard notes may stimulate persons to read a very scholarly and interesting book, to which my notice has not done justice.

H. W. GARROD.

REVIEWS

CELSUS DE MEDICINA.

Aulus Cornelius Celsus: Ueber die Artzneiwissenschaft; übersetzt und erklärt von EDUARD SCHELLER: zweite Auflage von WALTHER FRIEBOES. Braunschweig: Vieweg und Sohn, 1906. 8vo. Pp. xlii + 862. Tafeln iv. M. 18.

THE story of the *De Medicina* of Celsus is a remarkable one. On the one hand it is perhaps to be regarded as the chief treatise on Medicine, at any rate of the ancient world, for 'Hippocrates,' as we all know, is not a treatise but a Canon, or book of Scriptures; and of other eminent and even epoch-making works on Medicine, some are partial to particular fields of the art, in some the several chapters are out of proportion to each other, or again are clumsy or defective in literary form: yet the *De Medicina*, which in form and proportion is almost perfect, comes in all probability from the hand not of a physician but of a layman. And there are other curious and notable facts on record concerning the treatise; such as its disappearances for long periods of time, and the fitful and occasional glimpses of it during these obscurations. Of still wider interest is its place in history as a part of one of the most interesting experiments in the progress of ideas; the experiment of transplanting Greek ideas upon a people and a culture, neighbouring indeed—especially to the Greek provinces of Italy—but in bent, in prejudice, in self-consistency, in naïveté, and in religious faith profoundly alien where not in polar opposition. In the Etrusco-roman religion polytheism and its associated magic were carried to amazing degrees, degrees which seem extraordinary even for such phenomena. In Medicine not only the several functions but the several stages or perversions of function, as in childbirth for instance, had each its own little deity with a proper ritual and liturgy. It would be otiose, and here certainly inappropriate, to discuss the multifarious and pettifogging occupations of this pantheon. To this system of superstitious observance, Greek thought was in radical antagonism. To quote the well-known words of Hippocrates, 'The populace attribute the causes of diseases to God; but in my opinion all these sufferings, like all other things, are divine; and no one of them is either more divine or more human than another, but all are divine alike: each of them has however its own natural properties, and none arises save in natural order.' Compare this sentence with Cato's obligatory burdens to his otherwise not contemptible surgery, such as 'Incipe cantare in malo—Sanitas Fracto—motas vaeta daries dardaries astata taries, die

una paries, usque dum coeant,' and the rest of the rubbish which he enjoined on the practice of Medicine.

Stubborn as was the Roman reluctance against the invasion of Greek ideas, not only because of their solvent effect upon primitive institutions, but also, and with better reason, because of the immoral and enervating proclivities and the rascality of the hungry greeklings who flocked to shake the Roman pagoda tree; yet, such is the penetrating power of ideas, they stealthily made their way into Roman culture in spite of the antique fathers. In his recent book on *The Cities of St. Paul*, Sir William Ramsey illustrates this process in various departments of life. He points out how in the division of time municipal was gradually converted into national chronology; how farming the revenues was superseded by the collection of taxes; and how even in that sphere in which Rome was eminent, that of Law, devices were adopted by the praetors from Hellenistic practice, with slight modifications—not always improvements—in respect of wills, contracts, and the like. While thus religion, manners, language, literature, and even law were undergoing changes by the derivations of Greek ideas, medicine could not stand aloof.

The garrulous and splenetic censures of Pliny, and the scandals which he narrates, must be taken with salt; yet the fair face of Medicine can be saved from disgrace only by the presumption that the Greek pretenders to medicine who migrated to Rome in Republican and even in Julian times, were for the most part adventurers. They were as cunning, we are assured, as the Romans on whom they preyed were innocent; yet we are fain to wonder whence came the wealth whereof the innocents were plundered? Such cunning leeches as the Stertinii, or Vectius Valens, the minion of Messalina, derived their vast gains from the compatriots of Verres and the Luculli. Pliny grumbles at the inconstancy of medical doctrines no less than at the unruliness of the professors of the art; and Cato's medicine, or Varro's, was stolid enough no doubt. To cite Cato himself: 'Ex agricolis maxime pius quaestus, stabilissimusque consequitur.' *Scribonius Largus* consists altogether of traditional receipts and fantastic antidotes; and such indeed were the medicines which were promoted from the store-room to the drug closet of the Roman father. The swaggering Greek doctors however did not fail so to vaunt their novelties that Pliny saw the art changed daily like a garment; and he did not apprehend under these flaunting changes of flag the more serious and deeper development of doctrine.

Of this development Celsus shone as no original but as a masterly exponent; and his influence in patrician circles must have been cathartic. If more than one commentator has compared the *De Medicina* to a palimpsest in which the greek text glimmers through the latin, yet none has failed to admire the sagacity of the argument and the beauty of its form and expression. But far beyond symmetry, lucidity and concinnity, the most precious service of Celsus was that he created scientific latin; a boon which was gratefully recognised in the Revival of Learning when Celsus had a vogue in measure far exceeding his previous eclipse. After the invention of printing, 'no scientific work,' says M. Védrènes, 'was edited so often as his: more than sixty latin editions have appeared, not counting the many translations.' I would add that the boon consisted not only in the adroit latin rendering of greek words and phrases but in the greater achievement of so remodelling latin as to adapt it to the expression of greek ideas. Celsus indeed did for science what Cicero did for philosophy.

And yet we repeat the paradox that Celsus was a layman; the strange notion that a man of family spent all this time and refinement of labour upon a subject in which after all he could be but an amateur. As the del Lungos, who have devoted their time and scholarship to the elucidation of their great compatriot, decline to admit this conclusion, one however which has commended itself to most of his interpreters, it may be well to summarise a few of the chief reasons for it. The first of these is that the *De Medicina* was not an independent treatise but one Section of a many. In a word Celsus was a Summist—an 'Encyclopaedist'—and a guess has been made that the title of the whole system was 'Cestus,' a kind of title then fashionable,

as in those of Λύχνοι, Κέρας Ἀμαλθείας, Ἐγχειρίδιον, Πανδέκται, etc., etc., as recorded in a well-known passage in Pliny and Aulus Gellius. Whatever the general title may have been, the Section on medicine, by the tradition of the MSS., is headed 'Book vi.,' and commences thus: 'Ut alimenta corporibus sanis agricultura sic sanitatem aegris medicina promittit.' And although most of these Sections are lost, we possess much at least of the *De Agricultura*, as it was converted to his own use by Columella—let us hasten to add, with due acknowledgments, an early bud of literary ethics which soon withered. From Quintilian, and otherwise, we gather that among the Sections were Philosophy, Jurisprudence, Rhetoric, Strategy. The life of Celsus was somewhere between Augustus and Claudius, at which period the Roman father still exercised supreme control over his household; and among his privileges was that he 'vetted' not his cattle and his slaves only, but also his own family. Callings in life were not then differentiated in the way we are accustomed to; the Roman household was not, as in later times, 'attended by the family practitioner.' Athenaeus, the pneumatist, who lived under Claudius, considered that no man of position could afford to be ignorant of medicine. Were we then to try our hands at a fanciful title we might name the whole System 'The Compleat Roman Gentleman.'

The preparation of a book on Medicine, then, was not in those days so trenchant a slice out of a peculiar domain as it would be now. Moreover, of course, the sum of knowledge on the subject lay within very much narrower and more manageable limits. Of other arguments in favour of a lay authorship are that in certain places the professional reader perceives that the treatment of this point or that is not quite intimate; also that in paragraphs concerned with τὰ ἀιδοῖα he apologises for calling a spade a spade; a professional writer would have regarded this frankness as needing no apology, or he would have signified his meaning under technical terms. To the current arguments I would venture to add two more; first, that Celsus' very mastery of the vernacular tongue, his adaptation of it to new work, the breadth of view and sagacity which lead him through the doctrines of the schools without bias or submission to formula, the blending of Hippocratean and Alexandrian medicine, and the detached commonsense of the treatise point rather to a layman writing for laymen than to a physician writing for experts who are sure to smack of their schools, and are apt to be occupied more by technical particulars than by sagacious universals. Secondly, how are we to explain the disappearance of Celsus' work, with rare emergence, during some fourteen following centuries? The later Greek physicians in Rome never refer to Celsus; not perhaps from any jealousy of a lay interloper, but regarding him as a layman writing for lay folk, and not as an original authority. Thus during these centuries of Galen's unrivalled ascendency Celsus was set aside, not to rise into notoriety till the humanists were attracted by his style. More than once in this dark interval the *De Medicina* peeped out. By virtue of his latin Celsus seems to have survived obscurely in the closets of the monasteries; for instance, a few words are quoted from him in Gerbert's 169th letter (tenth century). Augustine is said to have made use of Celsus' Section on Philosophy; and a reference to him has been detected more than once in passages of Cassiodorus, which I have not verified; in one of them under the incorrect name of Caelius Aurelius. The work sprang into the light in 1443, when Thomas of Sarzana (Nicholas V.) discovered the fair MS. of the Ambrosian; but we read in Sabbadini that this was not the first discovery, for one less perfect was found by il Panormita at Siena in 1429, a copy of which seems to have been sent to Duke Humphry. How the editions ran thereafter we have seen already.

When the edition under review appeared upon the table one's impulse was, with the editions of the Del Lungos and of M. Védènes before one, to cry out—Another translation of Celsus! The first brief survey of this book however suffices to assure us that it is a very welcome addition to Celsus literature. No date of the first edition is apparent, but the interesting Preface by Professor Kobert of Rostock, though undated, is presumably new. The translation,

so far as a few test passages enable a reviewer to ascertain, is sound; and the elegancies of the latin shine through the german rendering, as in the original the greek shines through the latin. The scholarship notes are excellent in concision and point; a section of commentaries on the several books is appended, and to one of them a very useful lexicon — modestly called a 'Verzeichnis'—of drugs, foods, and diets. There are a few illustrations of instruments and surgical diseases. Finally is provided one of those full indexes which our German colleagues compile so faithfully. The appearance of this work, then, is more than justified; it is a valuable, if not indispensable, addition to the library of the medical historian.

CLIFFORD ALLBUTT.

JORDAN'S TOPOGRAPHIE DER STADT ROM.

Topographie der Stadt Rom im Alterthum. Von H. JORDAN. Erster Band. Dritte Abtheilung. Bearbeitet von CH. HÜLSEN. Berlin: Weidmann, 1907. 8vo. Pp. xxiv +709. 11 Plans. M. 16.

JORDAN'S well-known work on the topography of Rome has, twenty years after his death, been at last completed by the appearance of this volume. Professor Hülsen explains in the preface how he undertook in 1887 the task of finishing what was at the time without doubt the best handbook to Roman topography.

The first two parts of volume i., containing respectively the historical introduction, followed by the description of the site of Rome and of the city as a whole, and the topography of the central portion of the ancient city—had already appeared in 1878 and 1885, having been preceded, in 1871, by the second volume, which contained the result of Jordan's preliminary researches into the late classical and early mediaeval sources of information—the Notitia and Curiosum, the Itinerary of the Einsiedel pilgrim, and the various editions of the Mirabilia. There remained, therefore, the description in detail of the rest of the city, which Jordan had already begun, but with which he had not made any great progress. Professor Hülsen therefore found it advisable, while making use of Jordan's material, to begin the work afresh, abandoning the proposed division into old city, new city, and suburbs, and adopting that by the Augustan regions, in topographical, not in numerical order. He thus bears the full responsibility for what is really his own work from beginning to end.

That the completion of this volume has taken twenty years will not surprise anyone who knows the complexity of the material and its continual increase in quantity and variety. Not only have excavations and discoveries been practically continuous, whether occurring casually in the course of building operations, or undertaken *ex professo* with a view to scientific investigation, but researches in archives and libraries have brought, and are still bringing, new facts before us as to the changes which the city has undergone since the classical period. The collections of architectural and archaeological drawings and of the Renaissance engravings (many of the latter of great rarity) and subsequent periods are beginning to be worked through systematically and published: and the immense printed and manuscript literature upon the topography of Rome is becoming better known.

Professor Hülsen's treatment of the enormous amount of material which he has collected together is most skilful: the work of compressing it within reasonable bounds has been most successfully accomplished, and the description is extremely clear and illuminating. The labour of proof-correction, indeed, must have been very great; and yet the misprints that occur are comparatively few, and not of any great consequence.[1]

[1] On p. 632 the date of the erection of the temple of Aesculapius should be 463/291 (cf. p. 633, where the date is correct).